

To: Emshwiller, John[john.emshwiller@wsj.com]
From: Whitley, Christopher
Sent: Thur 12/17/2015 1:34:11 PM
Subject: RE: Follow-up questions re WSJ Story Inquiry re West Lake and Lead-210

Mid-December is always a busy time for us, and this site continues to require considerable resources. The closer to Christmas and New Year's, as in many places, there's a tendency for people here to want to take time off to be with their families (and in many cases to consume vacation/leave time before it gets wiped away at the start of the year). So, staffs are sometimes short. Project deadlines continue to bear down—as you are familiar. We just want to make sure the right people get the chance to weigh in so that we can provide you with the accurate answers. It can take time to do it right...

From: Emshwiller, John [<mailto:john.emshwiller@wsj.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, December 16, 2015 4:24 PM
To: Whitley, Christopher <Whitley.Christopher@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Follow-up questions re WSJ Story Inquiry re West Lake and Lead-210

Thanks. Something happening at the site that has the techs busy?

On Wed, Dec 16, 2015 at 2:08 PM, Whitley, Christopher <Whitley.Christopher@epa.gov> wrote:

John,

Still working on getting answers for you. Can't guarantee, but hopeful to have something for you in the next day or so. Our tech teams are extremely busy on this site at the moment.

Chris Whitley

Public Affairs Specialist

U.S. EPA Region 7 Office of Public Affairs

11201 Renner Boulevard

Lenexa, KS 66219

913-551-7394

From: Emshwiller, John [mailto:john.emshwiller@wsj.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 16, 2015 3:47 PM
To: Washburn, Ben <washburn.ben@epa.gov>
Cc: Whitley, Christopher <Whitley.Christopher@epa.gov>; Carey, Curtis <Carey.Curtis@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: Follow-up questions re WSJ Story Inquiry re West Lake and Lead-210

Chris,

I don't think I have yet gotten a response to the questions below. Just wanted to check where things stand. Thanks and best, John

Emshwiller, John <john.emshwiller@wsj.com>

Dec
14 (2 days ago)
ago)

to Ben, Christopher, Curtis

Ben,

Reading through the BMAC reports you sent links for, I notice that the final pre-CERCLIS report chose to cite (on page 9, Table 4) a remediation level in the soil for Lead-210 of 33.5pCi/g, which it said was the PRG for a 1 in 10,000 additional risk level. Some questions related to these numbers:

1. Why did the EPA choose the 1-in-10,000 risk range when, as I understand it, the agency's own guidelines (and perhaps federal law) requires getting as close as can be reasonably done to get down to a 1 in a million additional risk. Using a 1-in-a-million risk standard, wouldn't some of the Lead-210 readings at the BMAC exceed the PRG? If so, wouldn't that suggest remediation is needed?

2. In the clean-up of the federal complex at Fernald, Ohio, the EPA's Record of Decision (a copy of which is attached) set the offsite remediation level for Lead-210 in the soil at 2.2 pCi/g. (See Table 9-3). It would appear from the BMAC report that the EPA isn't using that remediation level related to West Lake or contamination generally in the St. Louis area. If the agency isn't using that level, why not?

Since I'm working on a possible story related to this, I'd appreciate getting responses as soon as possible.

Thanks and regards,

John

On Mon, Dec 14, 2015 at 10:29 AM, Emshwiller, John <john.emshwiller@wsj.com> wrote:

Ben,

Reading through the BMAC reports you sent links for, I notice that the final pre-CERCLIS report chose to cite (on page 9, Table 4) a remediation level in the soil for Lead-210 of 33.5pCi/g, which it said was the PRG for a 1 in 10,000 additional risk level. Some questions related to these numbers:

1. Why did the EPA choose the 1-in-10,000 risk range when, as I understand it, the agency's own guidelines (and perhaps federal law) requires getting as close as can be reasonably done to get down to a 1 in a million additional risk. Using a 1-in-a-million risk standard, wouldn't some of the Lead-210 readings at the BMAC exceed the PRG?

If so, wouldn't that suggest remediation is needed?

2. In the clean-up of the federal complex at Fernald, Ohio, the EPA's Record of Decision (a copy of which is attached) set the offsite remediation level for Lead-210 in the soil at 2.2 pCi/g. (See Table 9-3). It would appear from the BMAC report that the EPA isn't using that remediation level related to West Lake or contamination generally in the St. Louis area. If the agency isn't using that level, why not?

Since I'm working on a possible story related to this, I'd appreciate getting responses as soon as possible.

Thanks and regards,

John

On Fri, Dec 11, 2015 at 1:42 PM, Washburn, Ben <washburn.ben@epa.gov> wrote:

Hi John,

EPA has done soil sampling for Lead-210 in areas around the West Lake Landfill. In 2014, EPA conducted a comprehensive soil sampling event at the Bridgeton Municipal Athletic Complex (BMAC), in Bridgeton, Mo. BMAC is situated very close to the landfill. Lead-210 was one of the constituents for which EPA tested. EPA published the results of that investigation in the West Lake Update: http://www3.epa.gov/region07/cleanup/west_lake_landfill/pdf/west-lake-update-08-08-2014.pdf

The data associated with the investigation is also available online: http://www3.epa.gov/region07/cleanup/west_lake_landfill/document-archive.htm#SiteDocs If you scroll to the bottom of this page, the relevant technical documents are included in a section titled "Bridgeton Municipal Athletic Complex (BMAC) Pre-CERCLIS Screening."

EPA has also tested on-site for Lead-210. I'm still working with the Superfund program to gather that data, as the sampling is both historic and ongoing with current investigations. I don't think I'll be able to compile that information for you this afternoon, but will work towards that on Monday.

Thanks,

Benjamin M. Washburn

Public Affairs Specialist

EPA Region 7

(913) 551-7364

From: Emshwiller, John [mailto:john.emshwiller@wsj.com]

Sent: Friday, December 11, 2015 2:54 PM

To: Whitley, Christopher <Whitley.Christopher@epa.gov>; Washburn, Ben <washburn.ben@epa.gov>; casey.curtis@epa.gov

Subject: Re: WSJ Story Inquiry re West Lake and Lead-210

Just checking back in on my request regarding Lead-210 monitoring. thanks and regards, John

On Wed, Dec 9, 2015 at 1:36 PM, Whitley, Christopher <Whitley.Christopher@epa.gov> wrote:

I did indeed see it, John. I have already forwarded your initial email, and I will forward this follow-up, to my colleagues Ben Washburn and Curtis Carey, who are now handling inquiries related to this site. You should expect to hear from one of them soon.

Chris Whitley

Public Affairs Specialist

U.S. EPA Region 7 Office of Public Affairs

11201 Renner Boulevard

Lenexa, KS 66219

913-551-7394

From: Emshwiller, John [mailto:john.emshwiller@wsj.com]
Sent: Wednesday, December 09, 2015 3:34 PM
To: Whitley, Christopher <Whitley.Christopher@epa.gov>
Subject: Fwd: WSJ Story Inquiry re West Lake and Lead-210

Chris,

Just wanted to make sure that you saw this email I sent yesterday. Thanks and regards, John

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Emshwiller, John** <john.emshwiller@wsj.com>
Date: Tue, Dec 8, 2015 at 12:20 PM
Subject: WSJ Story Inquiry re West Lake and Lead-210
To: Whitley.christopher@epa.gov
Cc: John Emshwiller <john.emshwiller@wsj.com>

Chris,

I hope you've been well since we last talked. In connection with a story I am working on, I'd like to know if the EPA has done any sampling for Lead-210 at or in the vicinity of the West Lake landfill. If sampling has been done, what were the results? If sampling hasn't been done, why not?

Among other things, I have been reading a 1993 DOE report concerning contamination in the St. Louis area from the nuclear-weapons-related waste produced by the work at Mallinckrodt. A paragraph from that report is below. It indicates that the biggest health risk from the Mallinckrodt nuclear waste came from Lead-210. Since the story I am looking into could run fairly soon, I'd appreciate any response you could get in the next day or so.

Thanks and best, John

D.4.1 Radiological Risks

The estimated risks associated with the produce ingestion pathway from exposure

to radioactive contaminants range from 2.2×10^{-4} for the residential vicinity property

(current or future resident) to 2.6×10^{-2} for the HISS future resident (Tables D.5 and D.6).

An additional risk of 1.7×10^{-2} would be incurred by the HISS future resident from exposure

to contaminants iv. the waste pile (Table D.6). These risks all exceed the target risk range

of 1×10^{-6} to 1×10^{-4} . For each property, approximately 90% of the risk is contributed by

lead-210, with most of the remaining risk attributable to actinium-227 and protactinium-231

(Table D.5).

--

John Emshwiller

Senior Special Writer

Wall Street Journal

407 N. Maple Drive, Suite 104

Beverly Hills, Calif. 90210

w- 424-204-4817

m-213-718-0521

--

John Emshwiller

Senior Special Writer

Wall Street Journal

407 N. Maple Drive, Suite 104

Beverly Hills, Calif. 90210

w- 424-204-4817

m-213-718-0521

--

John Emshwiller

Senior Special Writer

Wall Street Journal

407 N. Maple Drive, Suite 104

Beverly Hills, Calif. 90210

w- 424-204-4817

m-213-718-0521

--

John Emshwiller

Senior Special Writer

Wall Street Journal

407 N. Maple Drive, Suite 104

Beverly Hills, Calif. 90210

w- 424-204-4817

m-213-718-0521

--

John Emshwiller

Senior Special Writer

Wall Street Journal

407 N. Maple Drive, Suite 104

Beverly Hills, Calif. 90210

w- 424-204-4817

m-213-718-0521

--

John Emshwiller

Senior Special Writer

Wall Street Journal

407 N. Maple Drive, Suite 104

Beverly Hills, Calif. 90210

w- 424-204-4817

m-213-718-0521